





The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

THE ECCLESIASTICAL PUMP.

TREATISE ON THE MODE OF BAPTISM, DESIGN OF
BAPTISM, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ONLY, ETC.

BY THE REV. J. H. NICHOLS,

Author of "Right of a Sinner to Pray," "Grub-ax," and "Reply to Errors of
the Anxious Seat."

Twentieth Thousand.

NASHVILLE, TENN.:

SOUTHERN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1887

Price, 10c. per copy; \$1 per dozen, by mail, postage paid.

Methodist
Historical Society

*Southern California-Arizona
Conference*



Presented by

Rev. B. Rhodes Martin
1959

BX

83307

N53

1887

THE ECCLESIASTICAL PUMP.

A TREATISE ON THE MODE OF BAPTISM, DESIGN OF
BAPTISM, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ONLY, ETC.

BY THE REV. J. H. NICHOLS,

Author of 'Right of a Sinner to Pray,' "Grub-ax," and "Reply to Errors of
the Anxious Seat."

NASHVILLE, TENN.:

SOUTHERN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1887.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884,
By J. H. NICHOLS,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

PREFACE.

"THEREFORE with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." (Isa. xii. 3.) From these wells we draw the "water of life." (Rev. xxii. 17.) Jesus says: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive)." (John vii. 37, 39.) As water is used in cleansing defiled garments, so the Spirit of God (or water of life) is used in cleansing souls defiled with sin. Seeing some have mistaken the water that forms rivers, lakes, and ponds for the water of life, I have invented a pump—a double-action instrument—which will, I trust, pump *out* this water, and pump *in* the water of life. In cleaning out this Campbellite well you need not be surprised if we find old boots, buckets, brickbats, dead frogs and rats, and a host of other unclean things so well calculated to produce ill health and bad temper in those who use the water. If we succeed in our undertaking, we will have done all earnest seekers after truth a real service.

INTRODUCTION.

1. IMMERSION either *is* or *is not* the Bible mode of baptism.
2. Water baptism either *is* or *is not* a condition of pardon.
3. A sinner either *can* or *cannot* be justified without water.
4. A sinner either *can* or *cannot* be justified by *faith only*.
5. The Spirit of God either *does* or *does not* come in direct contact with the heart in the work of regeneration.

To these, and many other minor points, this little work is devoted. Hoping it may be a benefit to many, an injury to none, I send it forth with my best wishes for all who may read it.

Bethel, Tenn., March 4, 1884.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL PUMP.

CAMPBELLITE. Well, well; here is my old Methodist friend, the "Grub-ax" man. I am glad to see you. I have had a time of it since I saw you. The Church expelled (or *withdrew* from) me, as they call it, because I would not confess that I was very sorry I had my children baptized. They said I had violated the word of God and ignored the teaching of the Church; so they left me out in the wicked world, as they say.

METHODIST. I am glad to see you. I believe I told you there would likely be some trouble about the baptism of your children. How are you feeling over the matter?

C. I am convinced that all our boasting about *no creed*, every one having his own private opinion, and the like, does very well until one's judgment comes in contact with the opinion of our elders, and then—well, somehow they manage to turn him out of the Church. But I remember when we parted last you spoke of another grubbing some day. If you have time, I should like to ask you a few questions about the mode of baptism.

M. I will gladly spare the time.

C. How did John Baptist baptize?

M. I know nothing whatever about it except what John and the divine Scripture writers say.

C. What do they say? Give me *chapter* and *verse*, for I am going to get close after you now on the mode of baptism.

M. John says: "I indeed baptize you *with* water" (Matt. iii. 11); "I indeed have baptized you *with* water; but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost" (Mark i. 8);

"John answered them, saying, I baptize *with* water" (John i. 26); "But he that sent me to baptize *with* water, the same is he which baptizeth *with* the Holy Ghost" (John i. 33). Jesus says: "For John truly baptized *with* water; but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 5). Peter says: "The Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized *with* water; but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost" (Acts xi. 15, 16). It is written, "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established" (2 Cor. xiii. 1). I have given you the repeated testimony of John, the testimony of Jesus and Peter, so I suppose John really baptized *with* water. What do you think of it?

C. O I believe nothing is baptism but immersion. It is written that John baptized "*in* Jordan—in the river Jordan," and that settles the question as to the mode of baptism. I can almost see John dipping them by the thousands.

M. You think John, Jesus, and Peter were mistaken about its being *with* water, and that John baptized *in* water. That is quite bold. Will you give me one verse that says he baptized *in* water?

C. No, but he *went down into the water*, and baptized, then *came up out of the water*. That ought to satisfy any reasonable man that he immersed *in water*. Come, lay aside your prejudice, and I will convince you that you are wrong about the mode of baptism.

M. It is written, "John did baptize in the wilderness" (Mark i. iv). Do you suppose John actually *dipped* the people into the soil of the wilderness?

C. No, of course he did not.

M. Baptizing *in* Jordan, you say, evidently means dipping into the water of Jordan; but baptizing *in* the wilderness does not mean dipping into the soil of the wilderness. I

suppose, then, the word *in* only means *dip* when it is connected with Jordan. Is that your idea?

C. W-e-l-l, I think when John baptized *in* Jordan he dipped the people into the water of Jordan.

M. "And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground *in the midst of Jordan.*" (Josh. iii. 17.) Now, if it had been written, "The priests stood in the midst of Jordan and baptized the people," would it not have been plain that they dipped the people into the water of Jordan?

C. I-I think so.

M. In several passages where it is said John baptized *with* water, it is also said that Jesus baptized *with* the Holy Ghost. I will give you one passage: "But he that sent me to baptize *with* water the same is he which baptizeth *with* the Holy Ghost" (John i. 33). Now, if we can find *how* Jesus baptized *with* the Holy Ghost, it will give us some light on the mode of baptism.

C. That is so. Now read Acts ii. 2, and you will see how they were baptized *with* the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. They were certainly immersed in the Holy Ghost, for it reads, "And it filled *all the house* where they were sitting." If that was not immersion, I should like to know what is. The house was *full*, and they were *in the house*.

M. Was it the Holy Ghost that filled the house?

C. Of course it was.

M. Please read the whole verse.

C. Acts ii. 2: "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting."

M. Ah! It was *sound* that filled the house. You and your brethren ought to quit trying to blindfold the world with your wrong construction of Acts ii. 2. This is not the first time I have heard you at it.

C. Sure enough, it was *sound* that filled the house; how did I happen to overlook that?

M. Like you *happen* to overlook a great many other things, I suppose. Now, let me give you a few passages which will show how Holy Ghost baptism was administered: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is *come upon you*" (Acts i. 8); "The Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word" (Acts x. 44); "I will *pour out* of my Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts ii. 17); "He hath *shed forth* this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts ii. 33). *Come upon, fell on, pour out, and shed forth*, are the only terms used in the Word of God to show how Jesus baptized *with* the Holy Ghost. Do you think Jesus *dipped* men and women *into the Holy Ghost*?

C. Of course he did not; but John certainly dipped people into the water of Jordan, I think.

M. John baptized *with* water, Jesus baptized *with* the Holy Ghost. Jesus's mode was *pouring*, John's mode was *dipping, you think!* If pouring the Holy Ghost upon the invisible man is baptizing with the Holy Ghost, does it not seem that pouring water upon the visible man would be baptizing with water?

C. It may to you, but there are so many other passages that settle the mode of baptism so clearly that all you have said has but little weight with me. The Bible teaches that the water in which baptism was performed was not brought, but they *always* found it in its native place.

M. "Can any man *forbid water*, that these should not be baptized?" (Acts x. 47). Does this not look like the water was to be brought?

C. I must confess that it does; but I think they went to water, for nothing is baptism but *immersion*, and they must have *gone to* water.

M. Take another case, Acts ix. 11: Saul was in the house

of Judas (verse 17); Ananias "entered into the house" (verse 18); Saul "arose and was baptized." Now, is it not plain that Saul was *in the house* of Judas, *standing on his feet*, when he was baptized.

C. It does look a little like it, but I suppose there was a *pool* in Judas's house, or Ananias and Saul went to a creek, or pool, and there Saul was immersed.

M. You *suppose*. Why not suppose that a river ran through Judas's house, or that a band of angels came from heaven, and on their bright wings bore Ananias and Saul away to Jordan, and sung a beautiful song while Ananias took Saul *down into the water* and *dipped* him? As well suppose that as any thing else. How is it that you boast so much about being the only people who take the *Bible alone*, and yet you have to *suppose* so much to make immersion the Bible mode of baptism?

C. We will drop Saul's case, if you please, and I will give you some Scripture that will settle this question beyond dispute.

M. Very well, let me have it.

C. Jesus says, "Except a man be *born of water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). See also Col. iii. 12. The terms "*birth*" and "*burial*" certainly refer to the mode of baptism, and that makes it very clear that immersion is the mode.

M. Truly the mode of baptism is quite accommodating. Agreeably to your idea it represents a *birth*; or, if you like, it may represent a *burial*. As if we should say cotton is a good picture of snow; or, if you like, it represents charcoal as well. The *birth* and *burial* of a man are the most remote

periods of his earthly existence, and they are as unlike as *snow* and *charcoal*; yet according to your idea of the mode of baptism it is a picture of a *birth* or a *burial*. A birth brings one into this world, and is hailed with joy; a burial takes him out of this world amid deep mourning. Birth is caused by *life*, burial takes place because of the absence of all life. Still, baptism represents a *birth* or a *burial*, as you like. No, my brother, you have made a mistake; baptism in no way represents a burial.

C. Certainly baptism is a *sign* of Christ's burial. You won't gainsay that, I hope.

M. Christ will settle this question: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii. 39, 40). Observe, 1. Jesus was speaking of his burial. 2. Of his burial he says, "No sign shall be given but the sign of Jonas." Now, you say *baptism* is a sign of his burial. You or the Saviour must be wrong. More than likely *you* are wrong. What about it?

C. W-e-l-l, how will you explain that passage? It says "buried with him by baptism;" and that must mean immersion, for you know when we bury a thing we cover it. Suppose your child dies, and the undertaker sprinkles a little dirt on its head and calls it a *burial*, how would that suit you?

M. Just as well as if he had plunged it about one foot under the dirt and jerked it out *immediately*, as you do when you dip people. When my friends are buried I want them to remain so until the resurrection. The passage has no reference whatever to the mode of baptism, as I understand it

C. I am astonished at you! What *does* it mean?

M. Read Romans vi. 2-11, and you will find these expressions, viz.: (1) "Dead to sin." (2) "Baptized into Jesus Christ"—not into water. (3) "Baptized into his death"—not into Jordan. (4) "Buried with him by baptism into death." ("Dead to sin.") (5) "We also should walk in newness of life." ("If a man be in Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." 2 Cor. v. 17.) (6) "We have been planted together in the likeness of his death." (7) "We shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (8) "Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed." ("And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Gal. v. 24.) (9) "We should not serve sin." (10) "He that is dead is freed"—or justified—"from sin." (11) "Dead indeed unto sin." (12) "Alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." ("I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God." Gal. ii. 20.) Now, it seems clear that the apostle was "discoursing of the '*burial*' of the '*body of sin*' by the baptism of the Holy Ghost;" the *quicken*ing of those "dead in trespasses and in sins" to a *new* life in Christ; the "*translation*" of a sinner from the "kingdom of darkness" "into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. i. 13.) Certainly no reference is had to the mode of baptism.

C. Yes, that is the way with you Methodists: you always see some *great spiritual* work in every thing. I know nothing of this *great spiritual change* about which you talk. The passage has reference to *immersion in water*, and you ought to *know* it.

M. In Rom. vi. 4, speaking of *how* this change was wrought, the apostle says: "Like as Christ was raised up from the

dead by the glory of the Father." Think a moment. Were any human hands employed in raising Christ from the dead?

C. Certainly not. He was raised by the power of God alone.

M. Did you ever see any one raised up from immersion by the power of God *alone*, without human hands?

C. Certainly not. The man who dips them always raises them from the burial, of course.

M. Then, where is the likeness between the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ and your manner of immersion? Certainly, those who placed the body of Jesus in the tomb did not raise him from the dead.

C. I never saw that point before, and I wish to dismiss the subject, and take up the design of baptism.

M. But you referred to Col. ii. 11, 12, and I wish to call your attention to a few points in that passage before leaving this subject. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Notice, (1) Whatever this passage refers to as being done was done "without hands," therefore it could not be immersion in water. (2) It is "circumcision," "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh." "Circumcision is that of the heart, *in the spirit*" (Rom. ii. 29). Paul certainly does not use circumcision in one sense when writing to the Romans, and in quite another when writing to the Colossians; so it is clear that this passage refers to a great work wrought in the spirit of man by the Holy Ghost, "through the faith of the operation of God," and not to the immersion of the body in water.

C. There, now! You see that *change* which you call a *great spiritual change* was wrought by *circumcision*. Now,

if a *fleshly* ordinance could produce such a change, why cannot immersion in water produce all the change necessary to becoming a Christian?

M. The apostle is speaking of *spiritual* circumcision, of which *fleshly* circumcision is only a *sign* or *picture*.

C. You astonish me! Who, but a *Methodist*, ever dreamed of a *spiritual* circumcision? You ought to know that it was a *fleshly rite*, given to the Jews to distinguish them from other nations. You ought to study your Bible more, then you would not commit such glaring blunders.

M. Moses, Jeremiah, and Paul seem to have made the same "blunder" you say I have made. Hear them: "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your *heart*, and be no more stiff-necked," Deut. x. 16; "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your hearts," Jer. iv. 4; "Neither is that circumcision which is *outward in the flesh*," but "circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit," Rom. ii. 28, 29. Here Paul says very emphatically that circumcision of the flesh "is *not* circumcision." It is only a *sign* or *picture* of spiritual circumcision.

C. Just give me chapter and verse, will you?

M. Yes, sir. Paul says of Abraham, when he received circumcision of the flesh, "And he received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet *being uncircumcised*," Rom. iv. 11. Observe, (1) Abraham was righteous before he received circumcision of the flesh, therefore *fleshly* circumcision could not have been a condition of pardon. (2) His righteousness was *by faith*—"Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness," Rom. iv. 3; Gen. xv. 6. Now, I will say, once for all, that all of the external rites and ordinances of the Church, in all ages, have only been *signs* or *pictures* of an inward, invisible work of grace. The sacrament of baptism and the Lord's Supper are *pictures*; the former, of

the new birth; the latter, "of our redemption by Christ's death." There is nothing in any or all of them that can cleanse a soul from sin. That must be done by the power of God's grace alone. There is but one baptism—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 5). The Holy Ghost "shed forth" on the soul cleanses it from all sin, and takes it into spiritual relation to Christ; and "clean water" shed forth on the body in baptism takes us into visible relation to Christ, or into the visible Church.

C. What blasphemy! Holy Ghost baptism ended with the apostolic age, and the "one baptism" you refer to is immersion in water. I am sorry that the sects will not stop so much nonsense about Holy Ghost baptism. Why is water baptism so called in the Bible if it is only a picture?

M. Why do Old and New Testament writers call circumcision of the flesh circumcision, when it is only a *sign* or *picture*, as I have shown by Scripture?

C. W-e-l-l, I do not know.

M. On entering a parlor, why do you say, "There is General Lee," when it is only his picture?

C. Because usage has made that mode of speaking a law of our language.

M. Very well. Jesus says of the sacramental bread and wine, "This is my body;" "this is my blood." Now, do we eat the *real flesh* and drink the *very blood* of Jesus in the Lord's Supper? or are *bread* and *wine* only pictures of his *body* and *blood*?

C. Somehow, my head feels a little dizzy, and I do not understand the matter just now.

M. But you said "Holy Ghost baptism passed away with the age of the apostles." Will you be so kind as to give me chapter and verse on that statement?

C. We—I—am a little giddy just now, and cannot think of any Scripture that sustains my assertion. But Mr. Camp-

bell was a great man, and that is what he said about it; and we all preach it that way.

M. To be consistent, you ought to quit preaching it that way, or stop your boasting about "taking the Bible alone" as your guide.

C. It would be very hard for me to see as you do on the work of the Spirit.

M. No doubt of that. The Pharisees lost sight of the work of the Spirit in a great measure, by deifying ordinances, and they became self-righteous and proscriptive. So with all who attach undue importance to immersion. They are likely to presume to be the only people who know every thing *perfectly* and do every thing *correctly*. Is it not common for your ministers to proclaim themselves the only true ministers of the New Testament *in the world*, and representatives of the only true Church under the sun?

C. Yes, I must say we have attached *great* importance to immersion, and have had but little to say about the work of the Spirit, except to ridicule the sects for teaching that he operates *directly* on the heart; and we do teach that we belong to the only true Church in the world. But I wish to discuss the design of Baptism. We hold and teach that no sinner can be saved from past sins without *immersion in water*; and the New Testament sustains our doctrine fully.

M. Before a physician can know what remedy is needed, he must know *where* the trouble is. So by learning what part of our being is the sinner, we may be able to discuss the matter more intelligently. "To the law;" "The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. xviii. 20); "Tribulation and anguish upon every *soul* of man that doeth evil" (Rom. ii. 9); "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul" (Ps. xix. 7); "That which is born of the Spirit, is spirit." (John iii. 6.) Here we learn, (1) that sin is in the soul;

(2) it is the *soul* that needs conversion, or a spiritual birth. Now, do you believe that *water* washes sin from the soul, or does the Spirit of God wash away our sins?

C. Nonsense. You are always talking about the Spirit washing the souls of men. Did n't you know that the Spirit of God is a *talking* Spirit, and does all his work by *talking*, and not by *direct contact* with our souls, as you teach? We read the words of the Spirit in the New Testament, *obey the gospel*, or submit to immersion, and *do* religion. That is all there is of it.

M. But tell me how sin is gotten out of the soul. David prayed to God in this language: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin" (Ps. li. 2). Now, what is the manner of this washing? Does God apply *water* to the soul, or does he use his *Spirit* in washing a soul?

C. In the *act of obedience* a sinner becomes a Christian, but certainly not by contact of God's Spirit with the soul. That is nonsense.

M. After speaking of a very wicked class of men, Paul says: "And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the *Spirit* of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 11). Notice that the *washing*, *sanctifying*, and *justifying* were all done by the "*Spirit*." But you say, Not so.

C. That's the way with you Methodists! Don't you know that God's Spirit is a *talking* Spirit, and does his work by *talking* and not *contact*?

M. Hear Paul again: "He saved us by the *washing* of regeneration and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us *abundantly*" (Titus iii. 5, 6). Does that look like *talking* or touching?

C. O that has reference to *immersion in water*.

M. It does! What an idea! God saves sinners by shed

ding the Holy Ghost on them abundantly; and that means immersion in water?"

C. That's what Mr. Campbell taught, and we all teach it that way.

M. Take another passage: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). The last words of the twelfth verse read, "So also is Christ;" thirteenth verse, "For by one Spirit," etc. Paul was considering how the various members get into Christ, the "one body," and he says they are "baptized into" him "by one Spirit."

C. There now! That means just this: By the direction of the Spirit we are all baptized, etc. So you see it is by the words of God's Spirit we are directed to immerse men on condition of faith, repentance, and confession, and not by contact.

M. Did you ever baptize anybody?

C. Yes, sir.

M. Did you do it by *words*, or did you *take hold* of the subject (as you immerse for baptism) and plunge him under the water?

C. O—o—f—course I took hold of the subject; but I cannot believe the Spirit *takes hold* of sinners and *puts them into Christ*.

M. Please read Romans viii. 2: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death." The idea seems to be this: While in sin, we are under sentence of death eternal; but when we "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," the Spirit *frees us* from this sentence—baptizes us "into Jesus Christ." This seems clear, does it not?

C. Not so clear to me. Can you give me an illustration that will make it plain to me?

M. I will try. Speaking of the coming of Christ, and of his majesty, the prophet says: "He is like a refiner's

fire, and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver" (Mal. iii. 2, 3). Notice that Christ is said to be like *fuller's soap*—that is, the use a fuller makes of soap in cleansing cloth illustrates the manner in which Jesus cleanses a soul. Now, you say all the washing done by the Spirit is done by the *words* of the Spirit. Suppose in passing your wash-shed you should see the soiled garments, soap, and water in the tub, and the washer-woman talking fluently and very earnestly about the process of cleansing clothes, and finally she says: "Only four steps necessary to the cleansing of filthy garments, (1) Believe they are soiled; (2) apply soap; (3) put them in the tub; (4) immersion." Then she plunges the tub, clothes, and all into the water, and jerks them out quickly, and declares that the washing is done, the garments are all clean. What would you think?

C. I would think she was an idiot. Everybody knows that the *soap*, *water*, and *washer-woman* must all come in contact with soiled clothes in order to cleanse them. What's the use of dipping the tub into the water to cleanse the clothes which are in the tub?

M. It is just about as necessary as it is to plunge a man's body into water to cleanse the soul which is in the body. Now, if your theory is true, and the prophet gave us the right illustration when he referred to the fuller's soap, your washer-woman washed your clothes right; but she did not wash them *at all*, as you admit. Now, what about your theory?

C. W-e-l-l—h-how do you understand that fuller's soap to illustrate a sinner's conversion?

M. The clothes, soap, and water are all *in* the tub, and no amount of labor done on the *outside* of the tub can possibly have any thing to do with cleansing the clothes. The

work of cleansing must be done *inside* the tub. So the soul is *in* the body, and no *dipping* or *soaking* of the body in water can have any thing to do with cleansing the soul; that must be done by the Spirit working "within" us. "It is God which worketh in you" (Phil. ii. 13). "God is a Spirit."

C. But what about the "refiner's fire?"

M. "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver" (Mal. iii. 3). Now, suppose we try to purify some gold or silver by your theory for purifying sinners. We will place the crude metal in a crucible, and then take four steps: (1) Believe there is metal in the ore; (2) it must be separated from the dross; (3) place in the crucible; (4) plunge crucible and all into the water. Will that process purify the gold or silver?

C. Of course it will not. The crucible must be placed in a heated furnace, and *intense* heat must be brought to bear on the contents of the crucible until it is thoroughly smelted; then the metal separates from the dross. When the refiner sees his image reflected from the metal, he pronounces it pure.

M. Just so when a sinner is deeply penitent. God's Spirit stirs him up "as an eagle stirreth up her nest" (Deut. xxxii. 11); and, like David, his "heart" is "hot within him, and while he thinks on his deplorable state the fire burns" (Ps. xxxix. 3). The Spirit of the Lord is in his heart "as a burning fire shut up in" his "bones" (Jer. xx. 9), melting his soul to tenderness and submission. He now believes "in the Lord Jesus Christ," and his soul reflects the image of Jesus, and he is saved, and——

C. Hold, brother! you've got me confused. I want to be done with this refining business. You said awhile gone that water baptism is a *sign* or *picture* of Holy Ghost bap

tism. If that be so, how can you baptize infants? They know nothing about Holy Ghost baptism, faith, or righteousness either.

M. Abraham was "ninety-nine" years old when he was circumcised (Gen. xvii. 1), and circumcision of the flesh was a "*sign*" of spiritual circumcision (Rom. iv. 11); and all that were circumcised were "debtors to the whole law" (Gal. v. 3). God said to Abraham, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised" (Gen. xvii. 12). But what did a babe of eight days know about doing the whole law?

C. Why, nothing, of course.

M. Then, if infants of eight days were proper subjects for circumcision, knowing nothing of its significance, can there be any impropriety in baptizing little babes that do not know what is signified by baptism?

C. You have got me so "befuddled" I hardly know what I am at. Tell me why you object to our teaching that immersion is essential to pardon.

M. Because the Bible does not sustain your theory.

C. Does the Bible oppose it? If so, give me chapter and verse. I do not wish to teach an error.

M. Will you promise that if I will show your teaching on this point to be contrary to the doctrine of the Bible you will abandon it?

C. I certainly will. But you must give chapter and verse.

M. I will do so. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5). Notice, there is but *one* mediator, and your theory makes *three*—viz., Christ, water, and the administrator of immersion. That puts the salvation of a sinner in men and in water, so that a sinner may read the word of life, and trust in Jesus with *all his* heart; may "*ask*," "*seek*," "*knock*," and although Jesus has assured such that they

should "receive," "find," the door of mercy should be "opened" (Matt. vii. 7, 8), all avails nothing without *water* and some one to *dip* the poor penitent. So your plan of salvation has *three* mediators; the Bible plan has but one.

C. We do not teach that water saves, or that one man can save another; and who says we do slanders us.

M. What does it matter? If a sinner cannot be saved without immersion in water, it is clear that he cannot be saved without water and some one to dip him. Hence it matters not whether the *water*, the *dipper*, or Christ saves; for if *water* or the *administrator* be absent, the result is the same as if Christ were away. *Without water and an administrator, the sinner is as hopelessly damned as he would be without Christ.*

C. We teach that it is the *act of obedience* in immersion that saves, and not water.

M. But that act of obedience cannot be performed *without water* and one to do the *dipping*. So you have not relieved the difficulty.

C. Have you any other objection to urge?

M. Yes, sir. Paul said to the Corinthians, "I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius, . . . and I baptized also the household of Stephanus. . . . For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 14-17). Observe: (1) If water baptism is essential to pardon, Paul left all the Corinthians in their sins except one household and two other persons, and he thanked God for it. (2) Christ left out one of the essentials when he commissioned him to preach, for Paul says, "Christ sent me *not to baptize*, but to preach the gospel." Again he says the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. i. 16). Notice: (1) The gospel saves "every one that believeth." (2) If baptism was

a part of the gospel that saves, and Paul was sent to preach that gospel, he was sent to baptize; but he says he "*was not sent to baptize.*" Again, in the same Epistle and to the same people, Paul said, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" (1 Cor. iv. 15). So you see they were saved "through the gospel," and not by water.

C. Yes, yes. You and I differ about Paul's writings. I will give you the *true* and *only* way by which a sinner must become a Christian: (1) He must believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; (2) he must repent; (3) he must make the good confession; and (4) he must be immersed. Now, by this order immersion is the *fourth* condition of pardon, and without it the other three steps—viz., faith, repentance, and confession—amount to nothing. It is clear then that after the three steps have been taken, the *whole salvation of the sinner depends on immersion.*

M. I am obliged for this honest statement of your doctrine, but I do not remember any Scripture that will sustain it. The only faith you require of a sinner is *assent* to the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and you put repentance after faith, and finally *all depends on immersion.* I think you fail to get a correct idea of the faith that justifies the sinner.

C. Philip required nothing of the eunuch but to "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts viii. 37). On that faith he immersed him; and what right have we to require more?

M. But we are talking about justification from past sins. Do you think the eunuch's sins were remitted at the time Philip baptized him, or was he a good man before that?

C. Of course his sins were pardoned *then.* How could he have been a good man before he was immersed?

M. Now, my brother, in regard to two points in the eunuch's case I think you Campbellites are laboring under a

great mistake: (1) As to his sins being pardoned at the time Philip baptized him, and (2) as to the mode of his baptism. Let us take a little time on his case.

C. Very well; and if you show that his sins were not pardoned at the time he was baptized, and that he was *not* immersed, I shall be surprised.

M. Can you give me *one* passage of Scripture which *intimates* that his sins were pardoned at that time?

C. No, sir; but what makes you think he was good before his baptism?

M. I have several reasons. (1) He came all the way from Ethiopia to "Jerusalem for to worship" (Acts viii. 27). (2) He must have believed in a coming Saviour, as all Jewish worship was based on faith in a coming Messiah. (3) It is not probable that a sinner would travel over three hundred miles in order to worship at the altar of the "true God." (4) There is nothing connected with the account of his baptism from which we could infer that he was a sinner, or that his sins were pardoned at the time of his baptism. Hence I conclude that he was a devout Christian before he was baptized.

C. Well, well; now just think of it! God sent Philip all the way from "Jerusalem unto Gaza" to baptize a man who was already a Christian. Why, he never believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God until Philip taught him. What was the use of sending Philip to him if he was already good?

M. What use was there in "Aquila and Priscilla" teaching Apollos—that "eloquent" and diligent teacher of "the things of the Lord"—"the way of God more perfectly?" (Acts xviii. 24–26). Certainly not that his sins might be pardoned, but that he might be a more intelligent teacher. Now, as I understand the eunuch's case, he was a devout worshiper of God, but living away down in Ethiopia, his

opportunities for learning about "Him who died on Calvary" were very poor. Of course, I suppose, he had heard about the crucifixion of Christ, but he had never been shown how the prophecy of Isaiah had been fulfilled in the death of Christ, and he was still looking for "Shiloh" to come. Philip showed him "the way of God more perfectly;" and when he saw how perfectly all the circumstances connected with the death of Jesus agreed with the prophecy of Isaiah, he said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." *Then and there* he accepted Jesus Christ as the Messiah for whom he had been looking, and whom he had been worshipping; and with this additional light, he was baptized, and "went on his way rejoicing." Do the Scriptures contradict my view of the eunuch's case?

C. I don't know that they do; and I must confess that your idea looks somewhat reasonable. I confess that I could not prove by the Bible that his sins were pardoned at the time of his baptism, but I think his baptism is the clearest case of immersion in the Bible. If he were not immersed, I am no longer an immersionist.

M. What is there about his baptism that looks like immersion to you?

C. Why, "*They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him;*" and they "came up out of the water" (Acts viii. 38, 39). "*Down into,*" "*up out of,*" and that not immersion? *Certainly* the eunuch was immersed.

M. Be careful. You say "down into" and "up out of" is immersion in this case. If that be so, immersion is not baptism at all, for baptism in this case came *after* the "down into" and *before* the "up out of." They "*went down into the water, and he baptized him.*" Then they *came up out of the water*. So you see "down into" was one thing, "*baptized him*" another, and "up out of" another. Just one

question: The word "*into*" occurs divers times in the Bible. Can you give me one case when it means immerse, in your judgment, except where it is connected with baptism?

C. I cannot think of one just now.

M. Now, let us go a little farther back, and consider this case more closely, as you think it is the clearest case of immersion in the Bible. Who was this eunuch?

C. He was a man "of great authority under Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure" (Acts viii. 27).

M. Very well. Then he must have been an educated man as well as a man of good sense, or he would not have occupied the high position of a man "of great authority" and the queen's treasurer. What was he doing when Philip went to him?

C. He was reading the "Prophet Esaias" (verse 30)—a prophecy concerning the crucifixion of Christ, found in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

M. What did Philip do?

C. "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus" (Acts viii. 35). Now, according to our usage, we would say Philip took the prophecy which the eunuch was reading for his text, and preached Jesus to the eunuch.

M. Of course you know the Bible was not divided into chapters and verses at that time.

C. Certainly; that was man's work many years after the baptism of the eunuch.

M. Of course you know, too, that the prophecy which the eunuch was reading is not all contained in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

C. Yes. It begins, I reckon, at the thirteenth verse of chapter fifty-two.

M. One other question: When a minister takes a text, is

it not expected that he will preach the doctrine contained in his text, and in the scripture immediately connected with his text?

C. He would not be expected to *contradict* any thing taught in his text or in connection with it.

M. Very well. Now, suppose Philip in his sermon to the eunuch had said: "Christ was *not* 'a Man of sorrows,' he did *not* 'bear our griefs' nor 'carry our sorrows,' he was *not* 'wounded for our transgressions' nor 'bruised for our iniquities,' we are *not* 'healed with his stripes,' 'the iniquity of us all' was *not* 'laid on him'"—what would the eunuch have thought of his sermon?

C. He certainly would have known that it was a flat contradiction of all that Isaiah said on those points in connection with Philip's text; and if he had any respect for the prophecy of Isaiah he could have had none for Philip.

M. In Isaiah lii. 15, in close connection with Philip's text, we find the only expression from which he could have gotten an idea of baptism in that connection, and it reads, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." You think if Philip had contradicted those other statements of the prophet he would have been unworthy of the eunuch's respect, but when he baptized the eunuch you think he *dipped* him, notwithstanding the prophet said "*sprinkle*." "O consistency!" Do you think the eunuch was dipped?

C. I must confess it looks a little doubtful.

M. To say that Philip dipped the eunuch is to charge him with a total disregard for the doctrine taught in connection with his text. Will you do that?

C. No. I must give up my former notions about the eunuch's baptism. As to the mode of baptism, I will make up my mind fully at another time. Let us go back to "faith." Paul says, "He that cometh to God must believe

that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb. xi. 6).

M. But Paul does not say believing there is a God who is able to reward all who seek him justifies the sinner. Of course a sinner must believe that much before he will seek God. The faith by which a sinner is justified is a faith of *reliance* or *committal*—a faith which *relies wholly on God, and commits all to him*.

C. Now, you want to begin a tedious talk about "justification by faith only." That is abominable to me. What do you mean by faith of *reliance* or *committal*?

M. Paul will explain: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him" (2 Tim. i. 12). What had he "*committed*" to God? "Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their *souls to him*" (1 Pet. iv. 19). It is one thing to believe that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and another thing to "*believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*." When the jailer asked, "What must I do to be saved?" he was told to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." You would have told him to believe that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

C. Somehow I fail to see the difference between believe *on* or *in* Christ and believing that he is the Son of God. I wish you would illustrate "faith of committal," as you call it.

M. Very well. There is a lawyer whom you believe to be the ablest lawyer in Tennessee, and you may believe it with *all your heart*, yet you may not feel the need of his service; or feeling this need, you may fail to *ask* for his service, and you will not be benefited by him. But if you *commit your cause to him*, you may receive benefit from him. So a sinner may have *no doubt* as to Jesus being the Son of God, and still remain a sinner; but if he will repent of his sins,

and "believe *on* the Lord Jesus Christ," committing all to him, shall be saved.

C. You think a sinner must *repent* before he can exercise faith that commits all to God. How can a man repent before he believes? You Methodists talk about *degrees* in faith. We require of a sinner *no faith* except to "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." That is all the *Bible* requires.

M. As to degrees in faith, we read of (1) "little faith," Matt. vi. 30; (2) "great faith," Matt. viii. 10; (3) "weak faith," Rom. xiv. 1; (4) "strong faith," Rom. iv. 20; (5) "working faith," Gal. v. 6; (6) "dead faith," James ii. 20; (7) "faith that saves the soul," Heb. x. 39. The devil believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God (James ii. 19), and perhaps he assents as fully to all the truths revealed in the Word of God as you do; but little stress is laid on faith of assent. As to repentance coming before faith of *reliance* or *committal*, we read the words of Jesus in Mark i. 15: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." Would you have it, "Believe ye, and repent the gospel?" In Acts xx. 21: "Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." In Matt. xxi 32, Jesus said to the Pharisees: "And ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward that ye might believe." Here it is taught that saving faith is impossible without repentance. In fact, repentance brings the sinner to where he can be justified *by faith*. Now, you always boast of taking the Bible alone as your guide; will you give me one verse that reads, "Believe and repent," as you always put it?

C. W-e-l-l, I don't remember one now.

M. Why, then, do you always say "faith and repentance," when in the Bible it is always put "repentance and faith?" According to the Bible plan of salvation, repentance is al

ways demanded of a sinner before he can exercise faith of *reliance*, which *commits* all to God *now*, and secures justification; but by your plan, stopping with the faith that merely *assents* to the fact that Jesus is the Son of God (just what the devil believes, Luke iv. 33, 34), you *change the order*, then tell the world that you are the only people who teach *exactly as the Bible teaches*. Either you or the New Testament writers are wrong. Which is wrong?

C. I—t—h—e—fact is I do not know any thing about a faith of committal. I know I believe “Jesus Christ is the Son of God,” and I committed myself to the minister, and he committed my body to the water about one second, and I have counted myself a Christian ever since I came up from the “liquid grave;” and I know nothing of a “great spiritual change” about which you talk. You teach that a sinner is “justified by faith only,” and I think that is contrary to Scripture and reason; and I think it *horrible and dangerous* doctrine.

M. Paul does not seem to view the doctrine as you do. After making an unanswerable argument on the subject, he gave his conclusion in this language: “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom. iii. 28); “But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. iv. 5); “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. v. 1). You Campbellites reach a conclusion very different from that reached by the apostle. He *excludes* all “deeds of the law” and “works;” you *include* immersion as a condition of justification. You conclude that a man is *not* justified by faith *without works*, or *faith only*; but Paul’s conclusion excludes works of *all kind*, and makes *faith* the only condition of justification.

C. Hold, brother! Now, let me give you some Scripture

which will show you the incorrectness of your doctrine. Believers are said, in the Scriptures, to be "justified by Christ" (Acts xiii. 39), "by grace" (Rom. iii. 24), "by his blood" (Rom. v. 9), "by the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. vi. 11), and "by works" (James ii. 24). If justification was by faith *only*, it could not be by Christ, by grace, by his blood, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by works. So you see you are altogether wrong when you say justification is by *faith only*.

M. Right honestly, brother, do you believe the passages you refer to speak of what is required of a sinner in order to his justification? or do they refer to what Jesus did for sinners when he died on the cross that they might be justified? To be very plain, do you believe a sinner must *create the Christ by whom he is justified, shed his blood, and furnish the grace* necessary to justification? We have been talking about what is required of a sinner in order to justification from past sins, and you use the passages referred to as though they were written as conditions of justification from past sins.

C. What do those passages mean, then?

M. I suppose no one but a Campbellite ever thought of their meaning any thing but about this: Jesus died—shed his blood—that grace might be given to the lost, that they might be "saved by grace through faith." Christ giving his life, his blood, and furnishing the grace, while the sinner exercises "*faith only*." Christ's part was to give his *life*, his *blood*, his *grace*; and the sinner's part is to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and "be saved."

C. But James says we are justified by works.

M. Was James speaking of a sinner being justified from past sins? or was he talking about a righteous man being justified in the sense of *approval* when he obeyed the command of God?

C. You puzzle me now. You know we teach that the

Acts is the only book in the Bible which tells a sinner what to do to be saved; but when we are *pressed*, we generally refer to James. Now, if I say James had reference to a sinner being justified from past sins, away goes our theory about the Acts being the only book which gives the conditions of pardon; and if I say he was speaking of a righteous man's being *approved* of God, or *justified* by his works, I give up our strongest passage in favor of a sinner's justification by works. So I do not know what to say.

M. What special case was James speaking of when he said, "By works a man is justified?"

C. He was speaking of Abraham being "justified by works, when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar" (James ii. 21).

M. Do you understand that Abraham was justified from past sins, or became a righteous man, by offering his son upon an altar? or, as a righteous man, did he offer his son in obedience to God's command, and was justified in this act of obedience?

C. I—eh—well, I don't exactly know. I——

M. You don't? In Genesis xv. 6 we have this statement: Abraham "believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." When Paul made his sublime argument on justification by faith, or "the remission of sins that are past" (Rom. iii. 25), he quotes Gen. xv. 6 as a proof-text (Rom. iv. 3). Hence we learn that Abraham was justified by faith. In Gen. xxii. 8-11 we have an account of Abraham offering Isaac upon an altar, in which act James says he was "justified by works." Now, the offering of Isaac was about twenty-two years after Abraham had been justified by faith. So you see it is a great perversion to say that James had reference to the justification of a sinner "from sins that are past." A sinner is justified from past sins "*by faith only*," and he remains in a justified state by *faith and*

works. First "make the tree good, and his fruit good," for "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matt. vii. 18, xii. 33); "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 26). And God approves the good works of his children. So *after* we become children *by faith*, we are said to be "justified by *works*."

C. I am obliged to you for that explanation, for I must confess I never was well pleased with our construction of James ii. 24. We made him contradict Moses and Paul in regard to Abraham's justification. I see now that Paul was speaking of the condition on which he *became* righteous, and James was speaking of how he *remained* righteous, and there is no contradiction. Can you give me an illustration that will make justification by faith any plainer to my mind?

M. I will try. "For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man . . . which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard" (Matt. xx. 1, 2). The hiring men to work for us, you will see, illustrates the manner of a sinner coming into the service of God. Now notice: (1) No work was required of the hirelings until after the agreement was made—"when he had *agreed* with them, . . . he sent them into his vineyard." (2) No pay was *demand*ed, or *given*, before the agreement was made. (3) The agreement was made upon the *promise* of one "penny a day;" hence the laborers entered into the agreement on *faith only*. (4) Their faith in the master of the vineyard pleased him, and they were justified in his sight, and taken into his service. (5) Being in his service, he *approves* all they do according to his will. Now, can you give me one passage that says we are justified by immersion?

C. W-e-l-l—no. But I wish to call your attention to

Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, it seems to me Peter teaches there that immersion is essential to pardon.

M. What we want is a pure heart, is it not?

C. Yes, sir.

M. Do you teach that a sinner's heart cannot be purified without immersion in water?

C. Not exactly. (1) Faith purifies the heart; (2) repentance purifies the life; (3) the good confession shows sincerity of purpose; and (4) immersion perfects conversion. That is what we teach.

M. What a mess! After the heart is purified by faith, you say, repentance must begin. Repent of what? Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. v. 8). Repent because they are prepared to see God? But repentance, you say, purifies the life, and confession shows sincerity. Now, you have a sincere man with a *pure* heart and a *pure* life, and still in a lost condition! That is truly monstrous doctrine!

C. But you have not explained the text I gave you. I wish you to explain 1 Peter iii. 21 also: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now *save us*." *There*, you see Peter says in so many words baptism saves us; and he said at Pentecost, "Be baptized *for the remission of sins*." Ah! that gets away with your doctrine. You can't get around that!

M. I am glad you gave me those two texts from Peter. I suppose he knew what he meant by them. Notice his language *carefully*—"The LIKE FIGURE whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Can baptism be both a *figure* of salvation and a *condition* of salvation?

C. W-e-l-l I don't exactly know.

M. What was Peter talking about?

C. He was talking about how Noah and his family were "saved by water."

M. Very well. Now turn to Genesis vii. 1-10, and let us see how Noah was "saved by water." (Verse 1) "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I found righteous before me in this generation." (Verse 4) "For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights." (Verse 7) "And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark, because of the waters of the flood." (Verse 10) "And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth." Please observe: (1) It did not take the flood to make Noah righteous—"For thee have I *found righteous* before me," saith the Lord, before *one drop* of the flood was upon the earth; (2) Noah was in the ark *seven days* before the rain began to fall; (3) the water *did not touch* Noah, *nor save* him: he was saved *in the ark, by faith*—"By faith, Noah . . . prepared an ark to the saving of his house" (Heb. xi. 7). Now, I hope you are able to see what Peter meant when he said baptism was a "*figure*." Certainly he used the word "baptized" in its proper sense at Pentecost; so according to his explanation of baptism, it is a "*figure*," "*sign*," or "*picture*" of spiritual cleansing.

C. From Peter's language, it seems that the people at Pentecost had to be *immersed* before they could receive the "gift of the Holy Ghost;" and that makes it clear to my mind that water baptism always came before Holy Ghost baptism, and was one of the *conditions* on which the Holy Spirit was received. That is the New Testament order, so I think.

M. Turn to Acts x. 43, 44, and let us see: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. While Peter

yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." Let us consider: (1) Peter was preaching the first sermon that was ever preached to the Gentiles, hence it was of the utmost importance that he tell them just what was essential to their justification; (2) he did not say *one word* to them about water until after the *Holy Ghost* had fallen on "all who heard the word;" (3) he preached *faith* as the only condition of pardon—"Who-soever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins;" (4) he preached the same condition of pardon that was preached by "*all the prophets*;" (5) soon as Peter announced *faith* as the condition of pardon, all who heard the word accepted Christ through *faith*, received "remission of sins through *faith* in his name," were filled with the Holy Ghost, and rejoiced; (6) after they had received "the gift of the Holy Ghost," and "magnified God" (verses 45, 46), "then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (verse 47). Now, Peter and the six Jewish brethren who went with him to the house of Cornelius were the only persons who had any right to object to the Gentiles being brought into the visible Church by water baptism. Peter seemed to think there could be no objection, as they had "received the Holy Ghost" as well as the Jews. I wish to know if you had been in Peter's stead, with your views of water salvation, would you not have mentioned "*water*" long before Peter did? Would you not have told them there was no "remission of sins" without immersion? that "remission of sins" through the name of Jesus, by *faith* only, was a *horrible* doctrine, *dangerous* and *hateful*?

C. See here, you are getting personal! Of course you know we teach that there is no remission of sins without immersion. But you made one point I had never noticed before

M. What is the point?

C. That Peter preached the same condition of justification which was preached by all the prophets. But since you showed me so clearly in "Grub-ax" that the present Church is a continuation of the Jewish Church, I can see no reason why the condition of salvation should not be the same.

M. But what about your doctrine? If you say "remission of sins" is not "through faith" in the name of Jesus, you brand Peter, *all the prophets*, Paul, and all the rest of the apostles, and Jesus himself, with libel! Jesus says, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have eternal life" (John iii. 14).

C. That seems to be strong; but the word *only* is not there. Now, you teach that justification is by *faith only*, and you have not produced one passage in support of your doctrine that has the word *only* in it.

M. Jesus takes the manner in which the bitten Israelites were saved from death by looking on the "fiery serpent" as an illustration of the manner in which he saves sinners by faith. As they looked on the serpent with the natural eye, and received *bodily cure*, so we look on Jesus with the eye of faith, and receive *spiritual cure*. Now, turn to Numbers xxi. 7-9, and you will find an account of the bitten Jews being saved. In verse 8 we read, "And it shall come to pass that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live." This is the language of God to Moses, telling him the condition on which the bitten men could be saved. Now, suppose Moses had said to the people, "The word *only* does not occur in this text, therefore looking *only* will not save you; in order to live, four steps are required: (1) you must look; (2) you must make a sin-offering; (3) you must make the good confession; and (4) you must *wash your*

bodies in water to perfect a cure"—what would you think of Moses?

C. I would think him *very presumptuous*.

M. Just so; and you deal with the Word of God just as Moses would have done had he acted as mentioned above. "O Lord, keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins!" (Ps. xix. 13). Jesus says, "As Moses lifted up the serpent, . . . so shall the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever *believeth in him*" shall "have eternal life;" and you say, "That is so, *provided the believer is immersed*, but *not so* if he is not immersed." How is that?

C. W-e-l-l—it has to be that way to fit our theory.

M. I say to you, "I will give you \$150 for your horse." You say, "That is a trade." I pay you the cash; then put your bridle and harness on the horse, and hitch him to your buggy. You say, "How is that?" I reply, "I did not say horse *only*. Before a horse can change owners, four steps are required: (1) The horse; (2) the bridle; (3) the harness; and (4) the buggy." So I give the horse the whip, and drive away. How would that suit you?

C. Not at all. I should think you were violating every principle of justice and honesty.

M. I would be dealing with you precisely as you deal with the Word of God. It is strange that a man of common sense will not see how foolish it is to talk about the word "only" as you do, until his bridle, harness, and buggy are taken from him on his use of the word.

C. I must confess you have given me new light on the doctrine of justification by faith only; and if you will explain two more passages to me as clearly as you have explained all I have given you, I do not see how I can continue my objections to justification by faith only. Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts xxii. 16). Now

it looks like baptism washed away Saul's sins, for it reads, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." How about it?

M. Notice carefully, "Arise, and be baptized." Now, suppose I say arising is baptism, because it reads, "Arise, and be baptized." How would that logic suit you?

C. Not at all. All who know the use of language know that simply expresses two acts, (1) arise, (2) be baptized; and the two acts are by no means the same.

M. Notice again, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins, *calling on the name of the Lord.*" Now, if he had said, "Be baptized, *washing* away thy sins," your doctrine could find some support here; but it reads, "Wash away thy sins, *calling on the name of the Lord.*" Observe, Saul was not told *how* to arise, nor *how* to be baptized, but he was told *how* to wash away his sins; that was to be done by "calling on the name of the Lord." It does seem that any man ought to know that the water of baptism cannot wash sin out of the soul.

C. That is satisfactory. But Galatians iii. 27 puzzles me: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Now, we cannot be saved *out of Christ*, and baptism puts us into Christ—then, how can we be saved without water?

M. What do you understand by the term "*into Christ?*"

C. I cannot tell just what it means; for you know that we do not admit that Christ has an *invisible spiritual* kingdom, into which men are brought by *invisible spiritual* baptism, as you teach; but when I read Romans x. 10, "With the heart man *believeth* unto righteousness," and the verse preceding the one I gave you (Gal. iii. 26), "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," also 1 Corinthians xii. 13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and when I notice what Peter said about the Centiles being baptized with the Holy Ghost, and the

condition on which they received it, I confess I am bewildered.

M. What did Peter say about it?

C. Well, he does not mention but one condition, as you showed from Acts x. 43. Then in Acts xv. 7, when he was explaining the matter to his Jewish brethren, he said, "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, AND BELIEVE." Again, in regard to the same matter, he said, in Acts xi. 17, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who BELIEVED on the Lord Jesus Christ." I say, when I read all these passages, it looks a little like there is such a thing as a great change being wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost "through faith in Jesus Christ," and that this wonderful change brings us into spiritual union with Christ, and may be what is meant by the expression "baptized into Jesus Christ;" but I do not know how it is.

M. I think you have a very correct idea of this matter.

C. But somehow I cannot see how justification can be by *faith only*. It seems to me that is suspending a man's salvation on too slender a thread. There seems to be nothing *tangible* or *comprehensible* about it. I always feel that men who want to be saved from past sins ought to *do* something. We believe in *doing* religion.

M. "Go work *in my vineyard*" is the command; but Jesus does not say *work your way into* the vineyard. Speaking of salvation from past sins, Paul says, "Not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. ii. 9). But you Campbellites will have *works* as a condition of justification. Perhaps that is why you *boast* so much about being *the only Church*. When Jairus "fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him" for his dying daughter, and there came one and said to him, "Thy daughter is dead, trouble not the Master," the ruler was ready to despair; but Jesus said to

(The page contains faint, illegible bleed-through from the reverse side.)

[illegible][illegible]

that *believeth not* shall be damned' (Mark xvi. 16). It was *never* said to a penitent sinner by any apostle, 'Be dipped, and thou shalt be saved;' but it was said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved' (Acts xvi. 31). Jesus *never* said to the blind, lame, or sick, 'According to your dipping, be it unto you;' but he *did say*, 'According to your *faith*, be it unto you' (Matt. ix. 29). He *never said* to one whose sins he had pardoned, 'Thy dipping hath saved thee;' but he *did say*, 'Thy *faith* hath saved thee' (Luke vii. 50). Hence I conclude that a sinner's justification is in no way dependent on an ocean, sea, gulf, lake, river, creek, pond, or pool." I confess I was somewhat upset by those remarks. The fact is, I have been afloat ever since we parted. In "Grub-ax" you upset me on infant baptism; and now it seems that you will convert me to the Methodist theory of "justification by faith only." I hardly know what to do. I want to do right.

M. You speak of "Grub-ax"—have you seen what Elder Lipscomb has to say of "Grub-ax" in the *Gospel Advocate*?

C. Yes, sir; I read all he wrote about it?

M. I did not know but what the Elder had converted you. He had a great many things to say against "Grub-ax."

C. I know he did; but I noticed that he did not touch some of its strongest points; and of those he pretended to answer he only made broad assertions, but failed to produce the proof. He showed very clearly that he was not able to meet your arguments, and he seemed to be angry with you about it; in fact, he seemed to be in a bad humor with all the editors who have given "Grub-ax" favorable notice, and all the preachers who have circulated it. He was as a "bear robbed of her whelps." Some things in the Elder's review were amusing to me.

M. What were the amusing points?

C. You know he began his review in his paper of August 8, 1883. In his first article he said he disliked to review "Grub-ax," because your points were "so shallow," and your "treatment of the subject so superficial;" then he occupied about *three times* as much space in his review as is contained in "Grub-ax;" and after all failed to overturn one single point in "Grub-ax," besides failing to notice many of the points at all. The fact is, our brethren who have ability are ashamed of his effort.

M. You must excuse the good editor. He was in a great strait. So many of the brethren had written to him about how much harm "Grub-ax" was doing to the cause of Campbellism, he felt that something *must be done*, so I suppose he did the best he could *under all the circumstances*. Let us "pass his imperfections by."

C. Many of our brethren have *preached* and *written* a great deal against "Grub-ax"—they all say it is a *very poor thing*. Now, if they really *think so*, why do n't they hush about it?

M. It is much easier to "grin" at an argument sometimes than it is to answer it; and some of your brethren seem to have learned that. But we will present all who have made "hard speeches" about "Grub-ax" and its author with our kindest regards, and allow them to "say on."

C. Now, before we part I will say, I wish to study the points you have made a few days, and if you have any thing that will give me additional light I would like to have it, for my mind is so stirred up on this question I must come to some conclusion. I cannot rest in this unsettled state of mind.

M. I have a synopsis of all we have talked about, with some additional thoughts. Take it, and study the points well, and give me your conclusion. Please do not come to the subject with "*one eye closed*," but open both eyes,

and look into the matter in the light of Scripture and reason.

C. I trust I am done with prejudice. We have boasted so much through our Church papers when we succeeded in proselyting a member from some of the *sects*, as we have always called them, that I have become heartily ashamed, and am determined never to be guilty of such unchristian conduct again. I will see you soon, and give you my

CONCLUSION.

M. Good-morning, Brother C. It has been six days since we parted; I hope you are ready to give me your conclusion.

C. Yes, sir. I have gone over all the ground carefully; and assisted by the manuscript you gave me, I think I got all the points fixed in my mind. I will give them to you as I got them up. You showed by many texts of Scripture (1) that John the Baptist baptized *with* water, not *in* water; (2) that John, Jesus, and Peter all say he baptized *with* water; (3) that it is quite strange that Campbellites say *in* always means immerse when connected with baptism; (4) that they admit *in* does not mean immerse when not connected with baptism; (5) that water baptism and Holy Ghost baptism are often mentioned in the same verse, and Holy Ghost baptism is always administered by pouring; (6) that if pouring the Holy Ghost upon the "*inward* man" is Holy Ghost baptism, pouring water upon the "*outward* man" must be water baptism; (7) that no man was ever dipped into the Holy Ghost, therefore if nothing is baptism but immersion, no man was ever baptized with the Holy Ghost; (8) that Saul was certainly baptized *in the house of Judas standing on his feet*; (9) that we Campbellites boast of being the only people who take the Bible *alone* as our guide, yet we have to *suppose a great many things* to make immersion

the Bible mode of baptism; (10) that baptism has no reference to a burial; (11) that there is no similarity between Christ's burial and immersion in water; (12) that Romans vi. 4 and Colossians ii. 11, 12 have no reference to the mode of baptism; (13) that fleshly circumcision was only a *sign* or *picture* of a work of grace in the heart; (14) that true circumcision is "of the *heart, in the spirit*;" (15) that water baptism is only a picture of Holy Ghost baptism; (16) that Holy Ghost baptism is the true baptism; (17) that the "shedding forth" of the Holy Ghost upon the "inward man" cleanses him from all sin; (18) that in the regeneration of the soul, the Spirit of God comes in contact with it as sensibly as water comes in contact with clothes when they are washed; (19) that water baptism is not a condition of justification; (20) that Christ is the only Mediator between God and men; (21) that if a sinner cannot be justified without immersion, water is a mediator between God and him; (22) that the administrator of immersion is also a mediator; (23) that the Campbellite theory puts *three* mediators between God and man, viz.: water, the man who does the *dipping*, and Christ; (24) that if the Campbellite doctrine is true, water and some one to immerse the sinner are as essential to salvation as Christ is; (25) that when Campbellites say, "Believe and repent," they reverse the Bible order; (26) that no man can be saved on *the* faith which merely assents to the truth; (27) that faith which *commits all to God* is justifying faith; (28) that justifying faith always comes after repentance; (29) that we are justified from past sins by faith only; (30) that after justification, good works meet God's approval, hence Christians are said to be justified by works; (31) that Noah was saved by faith, and not by water; (32) that the gift of the Holy Ghost is in no way dependent on water baptism; (33) that at the house of Cornelius, Peter preached the same condition of

justification that was preached by *all the prophets*; (34) that Peter did not mention water to the Gentiles until after they had received "remission of sins" through faith in the name of Jesus; (35) that Campbellites talk foolishly about the word *only*; (36) that in all cases of healing the sick, cleansing lepers, or forgiving sins, performed by Jesus while on earth, he did it all "according to faith," and not according to immersion; (37) that Jesus often said to the saved, "Thy faith hath saved thee," but he never said, "Thy immersion hath saved thee." There are many other points I will not mention, but must refer to the many forcible illustrations which set your points in such a clear light that I consider your arguments unanswerable. I also saw a note in the manuscript which brought to mind your closing remarks in your last speech on the proposition "Immersion is the fourth condition of pardon," in a discussion with one of our elders.

M. Can you repeat the remarks?

C. I think I can. You spoke of a young man who received a mortal wound in battle. A Campbellite minister went to him, when the following dialogue began: Soldier. "Brother, I am dying, without hope. What must I do to be saved?" Minister. "You must *believe, repent, confess,* and be *immersed.*" S. "There is no water here, and my life is so far gone that it is impossible for me to be carried to water before I die. Can't I be saved without water?"

M. "There is no promise for you without immersion." S. "My good mother gave me a Testament when I joined the army, and I remember reading in Matthew vii. 7, 8, 'Ask, and it shall be given you; . . . every one that asketh receiveth,' and I am willing to ask with all my heart, and in the name of Jesus, for pardon—can't I get it?" M. "No! without water you must be lost." S. "I read in John iii. 16, 'For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not per-

ish, but have everlasting life.' I am willing to believe in him with *all my soul*. May I not have life?" M. "No! no! *There is no salvation without water.*" S. "The jailer asked Paul the same question I asked you—'What must I do to be saved?'—and Paul said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' May I not be saved in the same way?" M. "No! Water! or you are lost forever!" S. "Peter said, 'To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.' O may I not have remission of sins on the same terms that *Christ, Peter, Paul—all the apostles, and all the prophets—offered it to the whole world?*" M. "Water! water!! water!!! Eternal damnation without water." You then said: "My friends, do you believe that God's plan of salvation is so human, so gross, that your salvation is suspended on an arm of flesh, or hid away in the bottom of some creek or pond? I know you do not. I declare to you, when certain men get up to preach, it is as if the 'fountains of the great deep' were broken up, and the water spouting, gushing, and lashing in every direction until your very head swims, and you feel as though you were thrown from a ship in mid-ocean during a fierce storm. It seems they think Jesus is on an island, and all who want salvation must *dive* to him. Jesus says, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life' (John xiv. 6), but they say, "Water is the *way to Christ*; water is the *way to pardon*—water! water!!

'Every mother, son, and daughter,
Here's the gospel in the water;
O ye blinded generation,
Won't you have this cheap salvation?'"

Now, I confess I was not in a good humor with you just then, but I see things in a different light now. O Lord, open mine eyes that I may see the truth clearly!

M. Amen. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to *all* men liberally, and upbraideth not" (James i. 5). "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26). The Lord grant you his Spirit!

C. I noticed one other point in the manuscript which I will repeat. "The Pharisees attached great importance to circumcision and all the ordinances of the law of Moses. In fact, in their extreme zeal for ordinances, they omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith" (Matt. xxiii. 23). They thanked God they were not like other men—they were *the Church*, better than others, but Jesus calls them "hypocrites," "fools and blind," making "clean the outside," but neglecting "that which is within." He bid them "cleanse first that which is within"—that they were like unto whited sepulchres," "beautiful without," but "within, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness;" that "outwardly" they "appear righteous unto men, but within are full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (Matt. xxiii. 1-28). Pharisees thought themselves so *pure* and *holy* that in their sight even Jesus had the "devil in him"—they were ready to sit in judgment on the case of any man, or set of men, who did not believe *just as they believed*, and *do just as they did*. Surely he was a *great sinner*, but they were *God's people*—*unmistakably* right, while all others were *undoubtedly wrong*, and on their way to ruin. So I have observed that those in our day who raise such a "hue and cry" about water! water!! water!!! and have but little to say about the Holy Ghost, except to ridicule the idea of such a thing as Holy Ghost baptism nowadays—saying that *direct* influence of the Spirit upon the heart ceased with the apostolic age—I say I have

noticed that they stress immersion as much as the Pharisees did circumcision, or more, crying in almost every sermon, "Water! water!!

'The only way to make men flee
The wrath to come, and set them free
From sin and sorrow, death and slaughter,
Is to *plunge* them in the water.'

Paul says, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," and the burden of his preaching was "Jesus Christ and him crucified;" but our Campbellite friends generally have *five times* as much to say about *water* as they say about Christ and the cross both. They seem to have read Paul's language about thus, "God forbid that I should glory save in water baptism, and that by immersion." Now, the Campbellites do not like you for your plainness of speech, but I have noticed carefully, and you have not done them any injustice. I confess that for years I have been worried with this constant cry for water! water!! I am done with it forever. I believe justification from past sins is by faith only—that the Holy Spirit comes in direct contact with the soul in regeneration—that at *any time* a sinner may "believe in the Lord Jesus Christ," and be "born of the Spirit;" and though all Campbellism should be arrayed against me, henceforth I intend to "look into the perfect law of liberty, and continue therein." Would like to talk to you some time on the work of the Holy Spirit.

M. I will be pleased to talk with you on that subject at another time. The work of the Holy Spirit is a subject of great interest to me, and when we enter upon that we shall need more time than we can spare now, as we have been long talking, and need a little rest. For the present we will part; but I hope we shall meet again soon. Meanwhile, my friend, let us not forget to pray that God may

give us both wisdom to understand his will and grace to do it.

C. Amen. Remember me also in your devotions. I have a neighbor who says he would like to see you and talk with you. He thinks he could give you some light on the Scriptures—says he wants to show you (1) how to rightly divide the word of truth; (2) that the Acts is the only book in the Bible which tells a sinner what to do to be saved; (3) that Holy Ghost baptism belonged to the apostolic age alone; (4) that your book of Discipline is all wrong—that you should not have such a book; and many other things which I will not mention.

M. Will be pleased to meet him. Have you any thing else to say before we part?

C. Only this: I wish to read another extract from the manuscript you gave me. I read it because it impressed me much, and I hope you will have it published. It reads as follows:

“What gives the Campbellite Church such influence over a certain class of restless, bustling people? Is it because her members lead quiet and peaceable lives, and show more of the ‘fruits of the Spirit’ in their daily walks than do the members of other Churches? No! Is it because her ministers are more deeply pious than the ministers of other Churches? No! Is it because they teach purer Bible doctrine than other Churches? No! The Protestant Churches of this land can compare the lives of their members and ministers, and the purity of their doctrine, with those of the Campbellite Church, and lose nothing by the comparison, I am sure. But whence cometh her influence? It comes from a false boast. She lifts up her voice and cries aloud: ‘We are the people who take the Bible alone! We will have no book but the Bible. We want no books of man’s make; God’s book is good enough for us. Come hither, all

the world, and join us on the Bible.' This is her boast; but what are the facts? They are these: She is busy, *very busy*, circulating her 'Old Path Guide,' 'Gospel Preacher,' 'Gospel Advocate,' 'Gospel Plan of Salvation,' and a *host* of other papers, books, pamphlets, tracts, and cards, crying all the while, '*The Bible alone!* we will have nothing but the Bible!' O consistency! When a boy, I remember to have seen a rule in some of the old arithmetics called the 'Rule of Supposition.' I must say that the gospel of the Campbellite Church, as proclaimed by her ministers, and published in her books and periodicals, is largely a 'Gospel of Supposition.' 1. They agree that infants of eight days old were taken into covenant relation with God under the old dispensation, but they *suppose* it should not be so under the new. They agree that God was pleased with those who observed his law in regard to the relation of infants to his covenant *then*, but they *suppose* he is angry with those who take their children into covenant relation with him now. They agree that the light of God's covenant was bright enough *then* to shine unto little babes, but they *suppose* it is faded and dim *now*, so that not one ray reaches the sweet innocent babe. They agree that it is written in Acts ii. 39, 'For the promise is unto you, and your children,' but they *suppose* your children are to have none of its benefits until they are able to choose for themselves. They agree that you would be very wicked and cruel were you to neglect the temporal comforts of your babes because they are incapable of choosing what is best for them, but they *suppose* you are vile and wicked if you give them the benefits of God's covenant without their consent. They agree that we have a Bible account of three household baptisms, but they *suppose* there were no children in any of these households; or, if there were children, they were of sufficient age to choose for themselves—they seem to be a little at a loss here

to know which supposition is correct. 2. Again: In order to *demonstrate* the fact (?) that immersion is the Bible mode of baptism, at Pentecost they *suppose* that the twelve apostles dipped *three thousand* persons in a very few hours (Acts ii. 41). They *suppose* that Ananias took Saul from the house of Judas to some convenient water—they do not seem to be certain as to where the water was found—and there dipped him (Acts ix. 18). They *suppose* that Peter took Cornelius, and his kinsmen and near friends, to some stream or pool (not mentioned in the Bible account, Acts x. 44–48), and dipped them all. They *suppose* that Paul and Silas took the Philippian jailer, and all his—the children, if any, being of proper age to make their own choice—at the hour of or soon after midnight, to some convenient pool or stream—they do not seem to be certain which—and immersed them (Acts xvi. 30–33). They *suppose* the six hundred thousand men, besides *children* (Ex. xii. 37)—they hardly know about the children, as they take that as typical of Christian baptism—were immersed in the sea, though the account says they went on dry land (Ex. xv. 19). They *suppose* that John Baptist immersed those who came to him from Jerusalem and Judea, and the vast multitudes who came from ‘all the region round about Jordan,’ though John says he baptized them ‘with water.’ 3. Once more: They agree that Jesus said of the Holy Ghost (John xvi. 8, 9), ‘When he is come he will reprove the world of sin, . . . because they believe not on me,’ but they *suppose* that it is folly to expect the Holy Ghost to reprove a sinner by direct contact with his spirit. They agree that it is written of the true followers of Jesus (2 Cor. iii. 3), ‘Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart;’ but they *suppose* the Spirit

does this writing in the heart somehow, without direct contact with the heart."

But why pursue these suppositions farther? I just wish to say that, so far as I can see, you are correct about the Campbellite gospel being largely a gospel of supposition.

M. True enough; but let us turn on the light, and try to induce them to keep in a good humor with us, while we try, by the help of God, to show unto them a more excellent way—the Bible way. Let us take heed that we love *truth*, and esteem him a true friend who will expose our errors. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend; but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. xxvii. 6).

THE END

A 061 010
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

THE RIGHT OF A SINNER TO PRAY

By Author of "The Furnace."

Those who teach "a sinner has no right to pray" have fallen in a dangerous error; their theory has no foundation in Scripture reason: the prophets, Christ, and his apostles, all taught different. Buy and read.

Price 5 cents per copy; 50 cents per dozen, by mail.

THE FURNACE.

By Same Author.

Depravity, Origin of the Soul, Capacity of the Soul, Direct Influence of the Holy Spirit, Divine Call to the Ministry, Why Methodists have a Creed, Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth.

Price 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THEOLOGICAL GRUB-AX.

By Same Author.

Campbellism grubbed up, root and branch. Infant baptism plainly taught in the Bible. No kingdom set up by John the Baptist in the wilderness, or by Peter at Pentecost. Twenty-five points maintained and sustained by the word of God.

Price 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

For any of the above pamphlets, send to

J. B. McFERRIN, Agent,

SOUTHERN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE

NASHVILLE, TENN.

BX
8337
.N53
1887

**THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA
91711**

A061010

8/94

DEMCO

